found for the mythi of the aboriginal Americans, and peradventure light be thrown on the relations of early man with the animals of America during the centuries which must have preceded the formation of the celts and pottery now before the Society.

Specimens of the Chiriquí celts were placed on the table, from the collections of Mr. Bollaert and Dr. Duprée, as well as the collection formed by Mr. J. W. Flower in the Somme valley, and some British specimens from Teddington Lock and Blackfriars Bridge, sent by Mr. Sass.

APRIL 1ST, 1862.

JOHN CRAWFURD, Esq., President, in the Chair.

The following new Fellows were announced:—Frederick Henry Scott, Esq.; Edward Warner, Esq

---

XIV.—*On the Antiquity of Man from the Evidence of Language.* By JOHN CRAWFURD, Esq., President.

THE periods usually assigned for man's first appearance on earth necessarily date only from the time when he had already attained such an amount of civilization as to enable him to frame some kind of record of his own career, and take no account of the many ages which must have transpired before he could have attained that power. Among the many facts which attest the high antiquity of man, the formation of language may be adduced; and, in the course of this short paper, I shall endeavour to bring forward a few of the most striking facts which it yields.

Language is not innate, but adventitious—a mere acquirement having its origin in the superiority of the human understanding, like any other acquisition derived from the same source. The evidence that such is the case is abundant. Infants are without language, and we see them slowly and gradually attaining it, in proportion as the brain acquires maturity. Children acquire with equal facility any language whatsoever; they can forget the first acquired language, and learn another.

Those born deaf are always dumb, and continue so for life; and this not from any defect in the organs of speech, but simply because the channel for the acquisition of language, the ear, is defective. They can no more learn to speak, than one born without legs could learn to walk. Without the sense of hearing, there would have been no language at all. In this case man would have no other advantage over the lower animals as to voice, save that of weeping and laughing, which he alone can do.

Among the unquestionable proofs that language is not innate, is the prodigious number of languages which exists—some with a

very narrow range of articulate sounds, others with a very wide one; some with words confined to single syllables, and others having many; some being of very simple, and others of very complex structure. Such a state of things necessarily implies that each tongue was a separate and distinct creation, or that each horde framed its own independent tongue.

If additional confirmation of the fact that language is an adventitious acquirement were wanting, it will be found in this, that a whole nation may lose its original tongue, and in its stead adopt any foreign one. The language which was the vernacular one of the Jews three thousand years ago, has ceased to be so for above two thousand years; and the descendants of those who spoke it are now speaking an infinity of foreign tongues—sometimes European and sometimes Asiatic. Languages derived from a single tongue of Italy, have superseded the many native languages which were once spoken in Spain, in France, and in Italy itself. A language of German origin has nearly displaced, not only all the native languages of Britain and Ireland, but the numerous ones of a large portion of America. Some eight millions of negros are planted in the New World, whose forefathers spoke many African tongues. These African tongues have nearly disappeared, having been supplanted by idioms derived from the German and Latin languages.

It necessarily follows from what has now been stated, that man, when he first appeared on earth, was destitute of language. He had to frame one: each separate tribe framed its own, and hence the multitude of tongues, However difficult may appear to us the task of framing a language, there can be no doubt that in every case the framers were arrant savages, which is proved by the fact, that the rudest tribes ever discovered had already completed the task of forming, for their own purpose, a perfect language. The languages spoken by the grovelling savages of Australia are in this state, and even more artificial and complex in their structure than those of many people far more advanced.

The first rudiments of language must have consisted of a few articulate sounds, in the attempts made by the speechless but social savages to make their wants and wishes known to each other; and from these first efforts to the time in which language had attained the completeness which we find it to have reached among the rudest tribes ever known to us, countless ages we must presume to have elapsed.

In every department of language we find evidence of the great antiquity of man. Between the time, for example, when men had acquired the art of fashioning a club, of kindling a fire, and of making a flint knife, and that in which writing was invented, many ages must have passed. The conditions of quality of race

and of local advantages must have been propitious, to allow of the discovery having been made at all; and so we find that it never has been made where these were not favourable.

The Egyptians must have attained a large measure of civilization before they invented symbolic or phonetic writing, and yet we find these in the most ancient of their monuments. The invention of letters has been made at many different points, extending from Italy to China—a clear proof that civilization had many independent sources; but such is everywhere the antiquity of the invention, that we can hardly in any case tell when or by whom it was made, although made in a hundred separate and distinct places.

Epochs or eras, depending as they must necessarily do on the art of writing, were, of course, of still later origin. They are all, indeed, of comparatively recent origin. The Jews, the Egyptians, and the Persians, had none at all. The Greek epoch dates only 776, and the Roman but 753, before the birth of Christ. The Assyrian or Babylonian epoch, made known to us only through the Greeks, dates before Christ only 747 years. The oldest epoch of the Hindus makes the world, and of course man, up to the present time, 3,872,960 years old. That, however, we know to be a fable spun from faithless brains. The oldest era of the same people, that has an air of authenticity, that of Buddha, dates 544 years before Christ. The era of Vikramaditya, of still better authenticity, dates but 57 years before Christ; while a very prevalent and probably a still more authentic one—that of Saka—is by seventy-nine years later than our own.

The Chinese reckon by cycles of sixty years, making the first year of their first cycle to correspond with the year before Christ 2,397. Even this, if it could be relied on, would only carry us back to the time when the Chinese, a people placed like the Egyptians and Hindus, under very favourable circumstances for development, had already attained such an amount of civilization as gave them the power of recording events, while it takes no account of the long ages which must have transpired before that point was reached.

The terms employed in the computation of time in the different stages of human progress, their poverty in the early stages, and their comparative maturity in more advanced ones, appear to afford material evidence of the antiquity of man. The Australian languages have no term for a solar day, for a month, or for a year. But the Australians living in latitudes with well marked seasons, have names for summer, winter, and spring, because a knowledge of these seasons is connected with the pursuit of food and shelter. Low as the Australians now are (and their position precluded their rising beyond it), a time necessarily was when they were

much lower, when they had not yet learnt the art of kindling a fire or of fashioning a club, of killing a kangaroo and converting its skin into a garment. To learn these arts as they now skilfully practise them would require many ages.

A similar poverty of language, in regard to the divisions of time, prevails in the ruder languages of Africa and America. The principal nations of the Philippine Islands had made considerable progress when first seen by Europeans; yet their languages have no native name for solar day, month, or year, for these have been taken from the languages of the more advanced Malayan nations. The language of Madagascar has no names for month or for year, and has taken both from the Malay; and it is remarkable, that the Malayan term for year has even reached the rude inhabitants of the islands of the Pacific.

All the nations of Asia, continental and insular, in possession of a written language, have been immemorially in possession of a kalendar which divided time into solar days, lunar months, and lunar years; and most of them, indeed, into a week, or the rude quarter of a lunation. The Jews, when the Pentateuch was written, were certainly in possession of all this division of time. The people who were then in possession of flocks and herds, and had a knowledge of the useful and precious metals, must many ages before have been as low as the Australians.

Of the manner in which speech was constructed until it acquired the form of a complete system, such as we find it to exist even among the rudest savages, by far the best account that has fallen in my way is to be found in an essay by the celebrated author of *The Wealth of Nations.* It is entitled *Considerations on the First Formation of Languages,* and always appended to his work on the *Theory of Moral Sentiments.*

On one point only I dissent from the opinions of the ingenious and judicious author. He divides all languages into two classes, those formed by inflexions or changes in the termination of words, and those formed by the help of prepositions and auxiliaries. The first of these he calls complex, and the last simple. The complex, according to him, was the primary form of all languages, and the simple but derivations, the products of the intermixture of nations speaking different tongues, and striving to make themselves intelligible to each other. In this case, one tongue would be adopted; and to make it easy, of mutual use, it would be stripped of its inflexions, easy prepositions and auxiliaries being substituted for them. In this manner I have no doubt were formed all the modern languages derived from the Latin, our own tongue from the Saxon, and several of the languages of India from the Sanskrit.

It is certain, however, that the principle cannot be of universal, or even of general application, and that there are many languages

of simple structure just as primitive as those of complex formation. Even the most complexly constructed tongues themselves have prepositions and auxiliaries, which they frequently use instead of inflexions. Nor, indeed, on the other hand, are languages generally of very simple structure devoid in particular departments of a great amount of complexity. The Polynesian, or leading language of the islands of the Pacific, with nouns and verbs of very simple structure, is of great complexity in its personal pronouns. Each of these has, for example, three forms of the genitive case, and no fewer than four plurals.

The conquest of one nation by another, and the permanent occupation of its territory by numerous invaders, would seem to be conditions necessary to the reduction of a language of complex to one of simple structure. One language may receive even a considerable infusion of another, without undergoing any change of structure.

There are cases in which even the conquest of one people by another, and the long possession of the conquered territory, may produce no change in the structure of language. This will happen when the conquerors and conquered are of opposite races that refuse to amalgamate, and speak uncongenial tongues. The Greek language has preserved its complex form almost perfectly against Oriental conquerors for many centuries; and eight centuries of Arabic conquest in Spain did not alter the grammatical structure of a tongue derived from Latin.

Conquerors may be so few in number, and speaking languages so little congenial with those of the conquered, that no change at all will take place through their intermixture. Tartar nations, speaking polysyllabic tongues, have been military masters of China for some three centuries without the smallest effect on the monosyllabic languages of that vast country. I do not believe that a large infusion of Persian, and along with it of Arabic, during seven centuries, has produced any change in the structure of the idioms of Hindustan: certainly it has not of the greater number of them.

On the other hand, the invaders may be so overwhelming and violent as to be able to supplant the language of the conquered by their own, without the latter undergoing any change. In this way it was that the Saxons substituted their own language for the native idioms of Britain, that language not losing its inflexions until it afterwards came to be intermixed with the speech of a new set of conquerors. The substitution of languages of Europe for those of the New World is a case of the same description, even a stronger one.

But, instead of all languages having been originally complex in structure, languages of this class would seem to be more the ex-

ception than the rule; and it is, at all events, quite certain that many languages exist which never could have been formed by inflexions, and others for which there is no evidence to show that they ever were so. The monosyllabic tongues—and they embrace those of at least a third part of the whole human race—are incapable of inflection, because you cannot well inflect a word which consists but of one syllable. Any change in termination in such a word would simply amount to a new word, and not to the modification of an old one.

The Arabic language is one of complex structure, and the Hebrew one of a simple; but there is no good ground for concluding from this that the Hebrew is a derivative of Arabic, nor that the Arabic is an older tongue than the Hebrew. The Malayan languages, however differing otherwise among themselves, are all of simple structure, with hardly a single case of inflection; but there is no trace in the Archipelago of any language of complex structure from which any of them could have been derived. Some of the more cultivated of them contain a considerable admixture of Sanskrit; but they are not, on this account, more simple in structure than those of the ruder, which contain few or no words of that foreign tongue.

It appears to me that the structural character which languages originally assumed would in a great measure be fortuitous, that is, it would depend on the whim or fancy of the first rude founders. Some tongues would start with monosyllabic and some with polysyllabic words, some with a simple and some with a complex structure, and, having done so, those who spoke them would persevere from mere habit. The Chinese started with monosyllables, and continue them. They had early invented symbolic writing, but never phonetic. The result is that their whole attention has been given to the former, which is a copious language, although only to the eye like our numeral characters, while their oral tongues are all very poor; inferior, indeed, to the monosyllabic languages of their far less cultivated neighbours, who have adopted phonetic writing, such as the Burmese and Siamese.

No doubt, however, there are facts in reference both to pronunciation and structure very difficult to account for, and which may possibly have some relation to physical differences of race. No monosyllabic language, whether in the Old or New World, seems ever to have existed west of the nations whom we have called Hindu-Chinese. Consonants, and especially gutturals, and other rough sounds, abound in the languages of Northern Europe. The languages of the Malayan race have few consonants, and many vowels. The Polynesian tongue has hardly half as many consonants as even the Malayan languages, and its words are mostly made up of vowels. The languages of the neighbours of the Poly-

nesians, the Pelagian negros, have as many consonants as most European tongues. These are anomalies difficult or impossible to account for.

The structure of the ancient languages of Europe, and, perhaps, of Central Asia, appears to have been formed by inflexions, while the Malayan and Polynesian tongues are invariably of very simple structure. The American tongues, even the language of the Esquimaux, are formed by what grammarians have called agglutination, which consists in combining in one word an aggregation of several words—often to the formation of a word comprising the meaning of an entire sentence. The process consists in combining parts or bits of words, much after the manner in which fragments of letters are used in the formation of words in the Arabic alphabet. This kind of formation, nearly universal in America, is wholly unknown in all other parts of the world.

Adam Smith, in the essay to which I have been referring, endeavours to show the manner in which language began to be formed. He supposes—and I think justly—that the first attempts would consist in giving names to familiar objects, that is, in forming nouns substantive. Adjectives, or words expressing quality, as of a more abstract nature, would naturally be of later invention. Verbs, or words expressing affirmation, must, he thinks, have been nearly coeval with nouns themselves, since without them nothing could be affirmed. He considers inflexions or changes in the termination of words to have arisen from the difficulty of inventing abstract terms to express relation, gender, number, time, mode, and voice; but it really appears to me that the difficulty would be as great in the one case as in the other.

Of the difficulty of forming such abstract terms, he gives as examples, among others, the prepositions which, in languages of simple structure, represent the cases of languages of complex structure. These are, in English, "to," "for," "with," "by," and "of." With respect to the last of these words, the most abstract of them, he says, "Ask any man of common acuteness what relation is expressed by the preposition 'above.' He will readily answer that of 'superiority;' but ask him what relation is expressed by the preposition 'of,' and, if he has not beforehand reflected a good deal upon such subjects, you may safely allow him a week to consider of his answer."—"The preposition 'of,'" he continues, "denotes relation in general in concrete with the correlative object. It marks that the noun substantive which was before it is somehow or other related to that which comes after it."

However abstract and metaphysical may be the nature of the preposition "of," a word to represent it, as far as my experience extends, is, notwithstanding, to be found in all languages, however rude. It seems to be true, however, that even in languages

of the simplest structure, a genitive case, formed by an inflection, is found along with it. Our own tongue, and some Indian languages, are examples of this.

Adam Smith justly considers the pronouns, or words invented to obviate the repetition of nouns, as terms very abstract and metaphysical, and as such not likely to have existed at all in the earlier period of language. In corroboration he adduces the well-known fact that the personal pronouns are among the last words acquired by children.

"Number," says the author of the essay, "considered in general without relation to any particular set of objects numbered, is one of the most abstract and metaphysical ideas which the mind of man is capable of forming, and consequently is not an idea which would readily occur to rude mortals who were just beginning to form a language."—"Words representing them," he adds, "although custom has rendered them familiar to us, express, perhaps, the most subtle and refined abstractions which the mind of man is capable of forming."

The truth of this view of the formation of numbers is corroborated by our observation of rude languages in which the process seems, as it were, to be still going on under our eyes. Among the Australian tribes "two," or a pair, make the extent of their numerals. Some other tribes have advanced to count as far as "five" and "ten." The Malayan nations have native numerals extending to a thousand, above which they borrow from the Sanskrit. The rude and imperfect numerals of some tribes would seem to have been superseded by the more comprehensive ones of more advanced nations. The most remarkable example of this that I am acquainted with is to be found in the general prevalence of the Malayan numerals among all the nations of the Malayan and Philippine Archipelagos; among the tribes, whether fair or negro, of the Islands of the Pacific; and even among the negroes of Madagascar. In the same manner the Roman numerals, whatever may have been their own origin, have been adopted to the supercession of their own by the Celtic nations. The two hands and the ten fingers seem to have been the main aids to the formation of the abstractions which Adam Smith considers so subtle. This will account for our finding the numeral scale sometimes binary, sometimes quinary, but generally decimal. Numerals would, no doubt, be among the last words invented, but this only because in the rudest time there was little need for them.

Of the difficulty of inventing auxiliaries, Adam Smith gives the substantive verb, which he truly states is to be found in all languages. "This verb," says he, "denotes, not the existence of any particular event, but existence in general. It is upon this

account the most abstract and metaphysical of all verbs, and, consequently, could by no means be of early invention."

However great the difficulties of constructing languages, there is no doubt that they were all conquered, and conquered, too, by mere savages. Language was even brought to perfection, as to structure, and for the expression of all ordinary ideas, by men who were, at best, but barbarians. The poems of Homer, composed before the invention of letters, are as perfect Greek as any that was ever after written. The Sanskrit language, in all its complexity and perfection of structure, was spoken and written at least three thousand years ago by men who, compared with their posterity, were certainly barbarians.

The Esquimaux, a people to whose progress Nature itself has set a limit, holding them, as it were, in inevitable barbarism, have yet framed a language of extraordinary complexity. Their nouns, adjectives, and pronouns have each of them six cases and three numbers, while their verbs express every modification of mode, time, and voice by inflexions without auxiliaries. "An example of a single verb," says Sir John Richardson, "would occupy many pages." Here, then, we have a language, formed by very rude men, whose only weapons are still of stone or bone, and whose only helpmate is the dog, equal in complexity, their boasted attribute, to Greek, Latin, and Sanskrit. The very imagination loses itself in contemplating the length of time it must have taken to frame such a tongue.

The race of savages who built the recently discovered pile villages of the Swiss lakes, and who had no other implements than stone axes, must have had a tolerably complete language, or they would not have exercised that degree of concert indispensable to their elaborate construction. The still ruder savages of Denmark, who, as the only record of their existence, have left us monstrous heaps of shells, the refuse of their feasts on cockles and oysters, must also have had their language. We may even conjecture what were the languages of the rude forefathers of the now civilized Swiss and Danes. In all probability they were Teutons by race, and their language contained the rough draught of that tongue in which Shakespear and Milton wrote, and Burke and Chatham spoke.

Languages, then, were formed everywhere by rude savages, and time alone seems to have been sufficient to have enabled them to elaborate a system perfect for its purpose, with every race of man. The vocabulary of the rudest tongue probably embraces not fewer than 10,000 words, every one of which had to be invented. These words, in order to form a coherent system, had often to undergo modifications of form, and some of them, besides their literal meaning, had to receive metaphorical ones. What ages, then,

must not have elapsed from the first attempts to assign names to a few familiar objects, to that in which language had attained the completion at which it had arrived as we find it even among cannibals?

Between the completion in question and the discovery of the art of writing, made only here and there, under very favourable conditions as to race and locality, how many additional ages must not have transpired? That discovery implies an advanced civilization, the fruit of very long time. If we consider the introduction of the art of writing among the Jews, for example, to have been only coeval with the Pentateuch, this alone would carry us back in the history of language for near 3,500 years, according to the usual computation. But at the time at which the Pentateuch was written, the cotemporary Egyptians were a far more civilized people than the Jews, and had been long in possession of the art of writing—an art of so remote an antiquity, that in no instance have we an authentic record of its invention.

From the sketch which I have now given of the formation of language, the conclusion is, I think, inevitable that the birth of Man is of vast antiquity. He came into the world without language, and in every case had to achieve the arduous and tedious task of constructing speech which, in the rudest form in which we find it, it must have taken many thousands of years to accomplish.

Mr. POOLE considered some points raised by the paper of high interest. In particular he drew attention to the history of the Arabic language, which, after spreading into various dialects, was reunited and renaturalized by the pilgrimage (before El-Islam) and the Fair of El-'Okádh. The modern Arabic, in its many dialects, is the result of the intermarriage of Arab conquerors with the daughters of alien races, and the inability of their children to speak so refined and intricate a language as the classical Arabic. With respect to the origin of language, although admitting that all languages could be classed as a monosyllabic agglutinate or amalgamate, as by Bunsen and the author of the *Genesis of the Earth*, etc., he was of the opinion of the latter, that languages presented phenomena which made it impossible that mere classes should represent a growth. He therefore supposed a barbarous and a civilized language from the remotest age, believing that no period of time could account for the growth of such languages as Hebrew from such as Chinese.

Mr. AMEUNEY said he must protest against the statements some authors had made, that Arabic is a branch of Hebrew. There is an impression that there is such a thing as a modern and ancient Arabic. There is no such thing as modern Arabic; and there is no word in Arabic which can be traced to any known language, excepting the modern words from Greek and Persian. The Arabic language, from the earliest times to the present hour, has never been improved; and, in the earliest times, the old writers expressed themselves even better than the Arabs do now. For six hundred years the Arabs have produced no poetry in any way equal to that of the ancients; and the poetry before Mohammed is better still.

Mr. SMITH, of Jordan Hill, agreed with the President that language was not created. At the same time, it was difficult to conceive a family, possessed with the powers of articulating, existing as such without forming a

language of some sort or other. Sounds of animals would be imitated, and so on would expressions of voice be made the means of communicating ideas. Thus a language would very rapidly spring up. It was remarkable to what perfection language had attained at a very early age, of which we had an instance in the poems of Homer. Many years ago, he had drawn up a vocabulary of the language of Polynesia; and there it was impossible not to generalize on the subject, as the President had done; and he could not avoid the conclusion that the rudeness and simplicity of the natives were reflected in their language.

Dr. HUNT thought the Fellows of the Society were greatly indebted to the President for bringing this important subject under notice as an evidence of the antiquity of man, not sufficiently discussed by ethnologists or geologists. But it must be remembered that the antiquity of the human race is not at all a novel idea to ethnologists; and thus, when works of art were found in the drift, they were by no means surprised at that occurrence, for it confirmed the deduction which had already been drawn from other branches of science. He perfectly agreed with the President that language gave strong evidence of the antiquity of man, but he was not quite sure as to the manner in which Mr. Crawfurd intended to reason that problem out. It seemed to him that we must take some assumption as the foundation of the reasoning—either of unity of origin, or of multiplicity of origins. If unity, an enormous antiquity only could be accordant with the slow development of language; but, if every savage race has developed its own language, he could not see how such an inference could be drawn to the same extent. The subject required to be argued on a logical basis. Dr. Wiseman, in his lectures on ethnology, contends that, if language was not originally a miraculous gift to man, a fabulous age would be required for its natural development; but, he says, other sciences prove this immense period never existed. Geology, however, has proved that it has existed; and the cardinal will have, in his next edition, to assert that recent researches in archæology and geology have proved that these immense periods are at the service of ethnologists, and may fairly be used as a basis for reasoning out the problem of the origin and development of language.

Mr. BURKE could not see how any evidence in favour of the great antiquity of man could be deduced from the diversity of languages, unless it could be shewn that the formation of these languages was strictly successive, and necessarily slow; and nothing of this kind had been shewn. Before we can infer antiquity, we must be able to stratify languages in such a manner as to shew either successive dominance or unequivocal derivation; and neither had been done to any sufficient extent. As to the fact of language, he saw nothing wonderful in it: it was a clear inevitability to a being gifted like man. Every animal possessing a voice has the rudiments of a language. The elements of the most elaborate languages consist only of vowels, consonants, and inflections, the two former constituting the body, and the latter the soul or meaning, and all three being instinctive, according to the grade of organization. Some animals have a language of one syllable only, varied by inflections; thus the *mo* or *bo* of the ox, and the *ma* or *ba* of the sheep. The dog utters at least two syllables, as *baw-waw*, and the cat three, as *mi-a-au*. It is inflection that gives meaning to articulate sounds, and inflections are spontaneous and universally intelligible. Even inferior animals understand them when they become very emphatic, and assume the character of emotional cries. The first act of conscious life is a speech in its natural tongue. As the months advance, the infant spontaneously enlarges his vocabulary; and, by the time it is two years old, a resistless tendency to mimicry and chatter exhausts itself in endless syllabic combinations irrespective of meaning. In fact, brains being given, the for-

mation of a language is inevitable, even in the course of a single lifetime. Not the least need of a miracle in the case.

Sir R. MURCHISON said he wished it were in his power to confirm the President's labours as a philologist. He must, however, express the thanks which were due to him for this attempt to develope a corroborative evidence of an antiquity for man that geologists of late had done so much to establish. For himself, he had endeavoured to sustain on physical evidence this opinion of man's great antiquity. Not only did the weapons of human manufacture lying in position in the drift deposits bear out this point, but the present physical conditions of the districts in France in which these flint implements were found, strongly supported the deduction, in shewing that very long periods of time must have been required to bring the country into its present aspect since the deposition of these flint-bearing accumulations.

Mr. POOLE expressed his opinion that the idea of a succession of periods indicated by stone, bronze, and iron implements, must be abandoned or modified, and the different classes of implements held to indicate rather races than periods. Stone and bronze weapons had been found together in England; and the ancient Egyptians used stone-tipped arrows long after they were well acquainted with metal-working, and had made implements of bronze, iron, and probably steel also.

The PRESIDENT said he concurred with Mr. Poole in respect to Arabic and Hebrew. No one could tell which was the most ancient; and, as to poetry, it had generally, if not always, preceded prose. Homer composed his poems before the Greeks knew how to write. Have the Arabs produced anything equal to Homer? He also concurred with Mr. Poole that Coptic was the same as modern Egyptian; and his reason was, that there was no other language from which it could be taken. The Egyptians, like the Arabs, never could make any considerable progress, and their language stood still with them. In the unity of the origin of languages he did not believe. In this room there were forty different races, and many more languages. There were two thousand languages in America; and often the people on one side of a stream could not understand those on the other. It was supposed there were more than five thousand languages in the world. He did not see that any statements had been made by the various speakers which tended to refute the doctrines he had advanced in his paper.

APRIL 15TH, 1862.

JOHN CRAWFURD, Esq., President, in the Chair.

The following presents were announced, and the thanks of the Society ordered to be returned to their respective donors:—

Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society (from the Society).—Athenæum (from the Proprietor).—Photographic Journal (from the Editor).—Journal of the Society of Arts (from the Society).—Marsden's Travels of Marco Polo; and Marsden's Malayan Grammar and Dictionary (from the President).—Mémoires de la Société Imperiale d'Emulation (from the Society).—Observations on the Hauser and Sulfulde Languages, by Wm. Balfour Bailee (from the Author).

The following new Fellows were announced:—A. D. Aulton, Esq.; W. S. Cockings, Esq.; W. W. Collins, Esq.; Alexander Guthrie, Esq.; James Guthrie, Esq.; H. Fowler Ransford, Esq.; John Shortt, Esq.; N. Henry Stevens, Esq.